

REMARKS

Claims 11, 13 and 14 have been examined. Claim 11 has been amended, claim 13 has been canceled, and new claim 17 has been added. Reconsideration of the claims, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Interview

Counsel wishes to thank the Examiner for the interview of May 9, 2006. A summary of the issues discussed is set forth in the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jaros in view of Warwick. This rejection is respectfully traversed in part and overcome in part.

Regarding the rejection of claim 11, the Office Action recites that while Jaros does not describe a queue for immediate production or for later processing, the Warwick patent does disclose such a limitation. Applicant disagrees. As discussed in the interview, Warwick fails to disclose any type of rule set which would place the request into a particular queue. Hence, claim 11 should be distinguishable.

However, in order to distinguish the claims, claim 11 has been amended to recite that the rule set includes both card type criteria and location criteria. Also, the request is linked to the card issuance component queue or the production queue based on the requested card type and the location where the request originated. Neither Jaros nor Warwick teaches such a limitation. While the Office Action refers to column 5, line 64, through column 6, line 4, of Warwick, as discussed in the interview, these limitations are not found in this passage. Hence, claim 11 as now amended is further distinguishable and in condition for allowance.

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Jaros, Warwick and Cheri. Claim 14 depends from claim 1 which is distinguishable over Jaros and Warwick as previously described. Since the Cheri patent also fails to teach such limitations, claim 14 is distinguishable and in condition for allowance.

Added Claim

New claim 17 has been added and claims a method for producing identification cards where requests can be placed in a card issuance type queue or a production type queue based on where card issuance machines are located and available for producing cards. Since the cited art fails to teach such limitations, claim 17 is in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 16, 2006

/Darin J. Gibby/
Darin J. Gibby
Reg. No. 38,464

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
DJG/jln
60770148 v1